

26th January 1949]

IV.—NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

(1) THE MADRAS ANIMAL SACRIFICES ABOLITION BILL, 1947
(L.C. BILL NO. 2 OF 1947)

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

*‘ that the Madras Animal Sacrifices Abolition Bill, 1947
(L.C. Bill No. 2 of 1947, be taken into consideration at once ’.*

“ Sir, in the first place I beg to point out that this Bill is of a limited character in its scope as well as in its objects. The aim of the Bill is to prevent the killing or maiming of animals in the precincts of temples. It does not aim at preventing killing of animals in all places. I knew that in certain other provinces Bills have been introduced to prevent the killing of certain animals, particularly cows, in any place at any time. It is not with a similar object that this Bill is introduced. Nor is this Bill to prevent cruelty to animals. I believe in 1890 an Act has been put on the Statute Book which prevents cruelty to animals.

“ Sir, the object of this Bill, as I said, is to put an end to the practice of killing or maiming or cutting of animals inside the precincts of temples. At the present time, Sir, all forms of cruelty to all kinds of animals, chiefly goats, pigs and buffaloes are committed in various places in the Presidency. The animals sacrificed are of various ages. Even before they are born, they are sacrificed in temples. Sir, in places like Mayuram, Devakottai and Palamcottah, the stomach of a pregnant goat is cut open and the young animal even before it is born is taken out and offered to the Goddess as sacrifice. In Tiruchirapalli in the Kulimariamman Koil, young goats of two or three months of age are killed and their blood is sucked by the poojari. Sir, there are various other forms of cruelty perpetrated in various other places. For instance, in the district of Nellore, the buffalo is put into a pit and people kill it by spearing it; and in a place in the Tirunelveli district, an iron spike is fixed on the ground and pigs are carried to a height and thrown on the spike. In Vriddhachalam in the South Arcot district, the goat is laid on the ground and its neck is cut with a chisel. In another place in the Vizagapatnam district, the pig is kept in a standing position and a spear is driven through its body from one end to another and in a place near Tuticorin, hundreds of sheep are allowed to run and people club the sheep to death. All these things are done in the name of religion. Sir, the Bill is, I submit, one of the reforms that is long overdue. It could not have been brought earlier, because while the British Government were in power, it was their declared policy not to interfere in anything, even remotely connected with religion. In the Travancore State, they have stopped the practice of sacrificing animals in temples and apparently no ill-effects have attended that reform in that State. Public opinion has very much come round and there is a demand throughout the Province for the immediate stopping of this practice and the only opposition that can possibly come is from the poojaris and the priests of these temples. They are the only group of

3-30
p.m

[Sri S. B. Adityan] [26th January 1949]

people who stand to gain by continuing this practice. Some of them are given the flesh of the sheep or the animals which are sacrificed and in some places, the poojaris are in receipt of an endowment or certain emoluments from the temples.

“ Sir, ever since 1937 when the Congress Government came into power, this practice has been steadily declining and has been voluntarily stopped in many places. Much good work in this field has also been done by the South India Humanitarian League and if I may tell one instance to the House, in 1937, in Palamcottah the propagandists of the League went and organized a move for stopping the practice of sacrificing animals in the temple there. The opposition in that area was very severe and the League therefore appealed to Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who was then the President of the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi sent a message through the Humanitarian League in these words :— ‘ Sacrificing of animals in the name of religion is the remnant of barbarism.’ Pandit Nehru sent a telegram to the League in the following terms : ‘ I am grieved to learn that it is proposed to offer animal sacrifices in temples. I think that such sacrifices are barbarous and degrade the name of religion. I trust that the authorities of the temples will pay heed to the sentiments of culture in this matter and refrain from such sacrifices.’ Sir, it was largely as a result of these messages that the animal sacrifice was stopped in that year, 1937, in Palamcottah. Following that, in several other places, this practice has been put an end to. I would mention in particular that as from 1939, no sacrifice has been made in the temple at Tiruvottiyur and in 1943, the practice was stopped at the Tillai Makali temple in Chidambaram and in the temple of Tiruppapuliyur and from 1946 it was stopped in the temple of Sankaranayinarkoil. In the Andhra districts also this practice has been stopped at Kavali and Tenali.

“ Sir, this Bill was published in the gazette some long time ago and since then the Secretary to the Legislature has received a number of Memoranda in support of this Bill from various municipalities and panchayat boards and also from various Sanghams and individuals. I believe that over 200 such representations have been received and if the number of signatories is taken into account, over thousand persons have signed and sent memoranda supporting this Bill.

“ Sir, in this connection I would like to relate an incident which happened in the life of Mahatma Gandhi and he has himself related his experience in his autobiography. He, with a friend of his, went to the Kali temple in Calcutta and he says as follows :—

‘ We reached the Kali temple. The sight of the blood which was flowing like a river penetrated our eyes and our hearts. I felt a great commotion in my mind for I had a feeling of indignation. I spoke to a friend about this cruel method of worship, but he said, “ the goats do not feel the pain. They are made

26th January 1949] [Sri S. B. Adityan]

insensible by the din or noise of the drums." I am unable to accept this. If the goats had the power of speech, they would have told a different story. I felt that it was necessary to root out this evil custom. I feel from the bottom of my heart that the life of the goat was not one bit less precious than the life of a man. I would not agree to the taking the life of a calf to support the life of a man; the more helpless the animal, the more is our duty to protect it. I pray to God that the poor animals be saved from this cruel habit and the temples be purified thereby. It is indeed surprising that our country, which is noted for its good sense, selflessness and piety has suffered this cruel custom for so long a time.

"Sir, with these words I move this Bill, the object of which is to stop this cruel custom so that this Province need not any more suffer this custom which has been condemned by public opinion and by our leaders.

"Sir, one amendment has been given notice of, namely, to include birds also along with animals and I accept that amendment. I move, Sir, that this Bill be taken into consideration at once."

SRI D. MANJAYA HEGDE :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to second the motion. This Bill is long overdue. Ever since the Congress Government took up office, it must have been their duty to have introduced such a measure and it is surprising to me why this Government who are very sympathetic towards the poor and the oppressed and who have brought forward so many measures to relieve their distress, have not taken up that attitude towards dumb animals which are sacrificed for no purpose in the name of God and religion, and brought in a measure like this earlier. Sir, God is the creator of all living beings and it certainly would not please Him to see His own creatures being sacrificed for His pleasure and so, what right have we, human beings, to kill such dumb animals to satisfy that very God? So, Sir, I think in the name of religion, of which we know very little, we should not allow all these barbarous acts which are condemned by all wise people. We have just now heard what Mahatma Gandhi has said about the sacrifice of animals in temples."

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"Mr. President, Sir, 3.45
if I venture to speak on this Bill and offer a few criticisms it is not p.m.
because that I am not in favour of the objects and reasons which have prompted my hon. Friend, Mr. Adityan, to bring forward this Bill, but because I want to draw attention to certain defects in drafting, which I trust my hon. Friend will agree to remedy. Sir, I have been reading the Hansard . . ."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"Cannot the hon. Member suggest the amendments when we take up the clauses?"

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"I am only saying this, Sir, because he may have some reasons . . ."

[26th January 1949]

MR. PRESIDENT:—"If the hon. Member accepts the principle of the motion, he may suggest the amendments when the clauses are moved."

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO:—"Then I shall say just a few words in support of the measure, Sir. I was reading the discussion in the Houses of Parliament on the clause relating to capital punishment in the Criminal Justice Bill. It was discussed by the great lions in both the Houses of Parliament. Being one of those who are against capital punishment, I wondered what feelings would be evoked in us if we were allowed to see a man being taken to the gallows. To my mind the way in which capital punishment is carried out is as abhorrent as the descriptions which my hon. Friend Mr. Adityan gave in respect of the practices that are followed in sacrificing animals. But the point for our consideration is whether this practice is to be put a stop to and whether the passing of this Bill alone will enable us to do so, or whether a more intensified work of the kind which the South India Humanitarian League is carrying on would be helpful in achieving our object. Sir, my friend says in clause 7—I am not going to move an amendment, Sir—that no person being in possession of any land or building forming part of the precincts of a temple shall willingly allow any sacrifice to be performed on such land or in such building. I do not know how we can find out whether a person willingly allowed or unwillingly allowed. Who is to bear the onus of proof, Sir? I wish to say that the mere fact that this offering has been made within the temple or a building forming part of the precincts of the temple which is under the supervision and control of the person concerned should be considered enough proof to say that the sacrifice has happened and it is for the person to prove that it has happened without his knowledge. I do not know why the word 'willingly' is used.

"Again in clause 8 (c) it is said: 'Any person found guilty of an offence under section 7 shall be punished with simple imprisonment which may extend to three months and fine which may extend to three hundred rupees.' Under clause 7, Mr. Adityan prescribes simple imprisonment which may extend to three months and fine. I do not know, Sir, why he is anxious that it should be 'and' and not 'or'. I am simply raising these points, Sir, and if Mr. Adityan has some arguments in favour of the wording that he has used, I am not going to move any amendment. I would like to know why Mr. Adityan is anxious that it should be 'and' and not 'or' as it is in the case of offences under clauses 5 and 6 of the Bill.

"Then, Sir, there is a small drafting amendment which Mr. Adityan himself may accept without anybody moving it in regard to the definition of the word 'sacrifice'. It is said 'sacrifice' means the killing or maiming of any animal for the purpose of, or with the view of, propitiating . . . I would put 'with the intention of' instead of 'with the view of'. That would read better.

26th January 1949] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

" Mr. Adityan has quoted great men in support of the principle underlying this Bill, Sir, and we are very glad he got the opportunity of sponsoring a reform which perhaps is long overdue and which owing to your kindness he has been enabled to get through to-day. With these words, Sir, I support the motion."

* SRI D. KRISHNAMURTHI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I want to oppose the Bill, not because I do not agree with the principle of the Bill, but because this House is not the proper place for bringing in reforms in matters purely religious. Of course it is a wellknown fact that the sastras declare that the killing of a sacrificial goat is necessary in yagnas and yagnas are being performed in various temples and goats and fowls are being killed for this purpose. Even in municipal slaughter-houses, goats are killed only after the performance of Bismilla and no pious Muslim will eat a goat which has been killed without pronouncing this formula. Goats and fowls are being killed before mosques and various other places on several occasions. It is certainly offending to our sense of humanity and kindness to tolerate them in a mass scale. But my submission is that this House is not the place to legislate and put a stop to it. It must be left to the institutions concerned to bring round people so that such offensive sacrifices are not resorted to in public. This legislation preventing or prohibiting sacrifices that have been enjoined by sastras or agamas or which have been the practice from time immemorial will, I am sure, work as a serious hardship to the religious sensibilities of the people. There will also be a lot of complications in the working of the Act. It may give room or it may be useful in the hands of some people to oppress some people who may think that it is a legitimate and right thing to do. We know that in all Mariamman temples (what is called Ammavaru in Telugu) on the New Year's day a number of people perform their vows or during the times of cholera and smallpox or for some such other reasons. I do not say that the Amman by receiving a gift of the small fowl or goat will eradicate these diseases. But the faith of the people is purely a matter of individual opinion and practice. If this Bill is viewed purely from the standpoint of humanity, then the slaughter-houses also will have to be closed and the fish markets will have to be closed and meat-eating ought to be prohibited. There is a school of medical opinion, Sir, that meat-eating is not absolutely necessary for human existence. Opinions differ. Whether it is given to a secular Legislative Council like this to legislate preventing animal sacrifices of any kind in temples and religious institutions is a question which we have to consider. I submit, Sir, that this will create a lot of difficulties and hardships. We will be transgressing into regions into which we are not entitled to go, especially in South India, where people are known to be very religious. But, Sir, we can invoke the aid of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, and the South India Humanitarian League to do propaganda and try to stop the sacrifices in individual cases or institutions where the killing is done in any offensive manner. I do not see any reason or necessity

[Sri D. Krishnamurthi] [26th January 1949]

for rushing through a Bill of this type thereby making it very difficult for people to enjoy what they consider to be their religious privileges which have been handed down to them from father to son from time immemorial. I oppose the Bill, Sir, on principle alone."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" I support the principle underlying the Bill, Sir. I do not agree with Mr. Krishnamurti that this House cannot go into a matter like this. In fact, law is the opinion of the people about their ideas of right and wrong and law grows. Old order changeth yielding place to new. Perhaps some centuries back, the Hindus believed in animal sacrifices. To-day the educated and cultured people and the advanced opinion in the Hindu society and outside the Hindu society believe that animal sacrifices are not necessary."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" Some people believe in human sacrifices also."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Sir, the duty of the Members of the Legislature is to find out what public opinion is and advanced opinion is. Among the Hindus, I believe, advanced and cultured opinion is that there should not be any sacrifices in the temples. I give my hearty support to the Bill and compliment Mr. Adityan on bringing it and at the same time express the regret—or repeat the regret expressed by the Secorder of the Bill—that the Popular Government did not bring it."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" They want to give you the credit for it."

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Mr. President, Sir, the Government do not oppose the Bill. I want to mention only one or two points. Mr. Suryanarayana Rao said that it would have been better work for a humanitarian league and the opinion also was shared by Mr. Krishnamurti. Now there is a matter pending in South Kanara. In a particular place there, a particular community has been doing a sort of buffalo sacrifice every year. It has been very vehemently opposed by other sections of the people for the last so many years but it was continued. This year also the buffalo which was to be sacrificed was marched off with all paraphernalia and the other party opposed it and there was the likelihood of a breach of the peace and an order under section 144 was passed by the Magistrate prohibiting any sacrifice for a particular period. The moment that period was over the party again took out the procession with the buffalo and again section 144 was invoked. I have been praying for the passing of this Bill, Sir, so that at least in that place there may not be a breach of the peace immediately. In spite of the humanitarian league and other workers there will be a breach of the peace if the animal sacrifice is continued. The Government may place whole platoons of their special police fully armed but if the sacrifice is not prohibited by legislation there will be a breach of the peace and it will be very difficult to handle such cases. That is the position."

26th January 1949] [Sri K. Madhava Menon]

"Then, Sir, Mr. Krishnamurti was referring to religious sentiments, etc. As you were pleased to observe, Sir, our Puranas and Sastras allow for the sacrifice of a person but in these days will we allow a human being to be sacrificed? I am also a religiously-minded Hindu, Sir, and I am sure we are habituated to think that whatever we like the Gods also will like. And some people who are accustomed to take meat contribute it to the Gods also. That is the position. In most of the temples where these sacrifices are carried out it is the custom that the remaining portion will be given back to the person making the sacrifice. If that is abolished and if no portion will be given back I may say that 99 per cent or 100 per cent of the sacrifices will stop.

"The person who does the sacrifice in places in Malabar gets 4 p.m. the head of the bird and the body goes to the owner who offers the bird for sacrifice. Therefore, there is always the struggle between the person who cuts the bird and the person who offers the bird as to which place the person should cut so that he may take a larger portion of the head. In the case of goats also, there is the struggle between the owner of the goat and the man who cuts the goat as to where he should cut. I was feeling, Sir, that if there is a law that the sacrificed animal or bird will not go back to the persons who cut the animal or bird and the persons who offer them for sacrifice, that itself will suffice to stop the sacrifice, and no other law is necessary. Sir, it is only making or attempting to make Gods human."

* THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—"Sir, I support the Bill wholeheartedly. But I am yet in doubt whether such a Bill is necessary or whether on passing this Bill we are going to effect the reform which is so desirable. My personal experience is that people do not wait for law to be told that these sacrifices cannot be made. People have been making sacrifices for a very long time. Nobody ever thought about it. The various forms it has taken is an indication of the debased nature of the society in which we live. I know of one instance in a village where buffaloes are sacrificed. The sacrifice there is not by merely killing the animal. But the people bring a buffalo with all the ceremonies, and attract as much of the crowd as possible to the place of sacrifice. The animal that is brought there is a very healthy one. The pleasure in the sacrifice is not so much in killing the animal. But every fellow who is there takes a spear and pierces the animal with all his might. The animal has got to be killed only in that way. The torture that is undergone by the animal for hours together is most inhuman that I have ever witnessed. But, Sir, it is nothing strange or unique. Sacrifice of buffaloes is going on everywhere. Slaughter of buffaloes is permitted and hundreds of them are being slaughtered. In fact the Agriculture Department will be justified in supporting this law in the interests of agriculture. The sacrifice of buffaloes—innocent animals—should not at all be tolerated. It is not mere animals that I am referring to. I refer to the killing

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan] [26th January 1949]

of birds also. I know the activities of the Humanitarian League. They have become so soft in their propaganda that they have become ineffective. A mere wish does not reform people. In a big city like Tiruchirappalli sacrifice of hundreds of goats has been going on openly and publicly every year. The Government provide police handbust for that sacrifice. Some person cuts the goat and places it before the altar. Some bestial fellow goes and drinks the blood of the goat in a most awful manner. We have been encouraging those things. Side by side, I know the activities of the Humanitarian League. For the last so many years, they have not been doing any effective work. I do not believe that this law is going to effectively stop the sacrifices. People must be educated well. It is a common superstition that Gods are pleased with the sacrifice. It is a superstition which is going on much to the degradation of the Hindu community. Things have come to such a stage that people believe that we cannot stop the sacrifices, because that would rouse the anger of the Gods. Such curious beliefs have developed, and it is high time that such beliefs are dispelled. This Bill, although it becomes law, will not help very much. But legally, it gives sanction to preach that the law prevents the sacrifice. It is only in that way I can support the Bill, although I am convinced that the Bill is a good one."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" Are you replying to the debate? "

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" Sir, my Hon. Friends, Mr. Madhava Menon and Dr. Rajan, have answered well already. I do not propose to answer now."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

' that the Madras Animal Sacrifices Abolition Bill, 1947 (L.C. Bill No. 2 of 1947), be taken into consideration.' "

The motion was put and carried.

Clause 1.

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

' For the words " animal sacrifices " occurring in the long title, preamble and clause (1), substitute the words " animal and bird sacrifices." '

Legal pandits have doubted whether the term ' animal ' includes birds also. The definition given to ' animals ' in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act is, animal means domestic or captured animals. Legal pandits have distinguished between feathered and other animals. But, by way of abundant caution we have brought forward this amendment."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" You are not moving it as a member of the Government? "

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, this is a Government amendment. The amendment is brought forward after a decision by the whole Cabinet."

26th January 1949]

THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I accept the amendment, Sir."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 1, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 2.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 4.

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

'In clause 4 (ii), after the words "any animal", insert the words "or bird".'

Sir, it is only a consequential amendment to the one already accepted by the House."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I accept the amendment, Sir.

" Mr. Suryanarayana Rao has raised the point that the word 'intention' would be a better and legal word than 'view' in sub-clause (ii). Instead of the word 'view' can I put in the word 'intention' now?"

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The Hon. Minister can put that in his amendment."

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

'For the word "view" in sub-clause (ii), the word "intention" be substituted.'

Both the amendments were then put and carried.

Clause 4, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 5.

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I move—

'In clause 5, after the words "any animal", insert the words "or bird".'

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I feel there is a snag in this clause. The clause reads 'No person shall sacrifice any animal inside any temple or its precincts.' The definition of precincts given in clause 4 is lands and buildings ordinarily used for sacrifice. Suppose the sacrifice is made a few yards away from the usual place; how can the Government prevent the sacrifice?"

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I talked about this point with others, Sir. The term 'precincts' in relation to a temple

[Sri S. B. Adityan] [26th January 1949]

includes all lands and buildings near a temple, whether belonging to the temple or not, ordinarily used for purposes connected with the worship of the temple, and in particular shall include the mandapams, prakarams, frontyards and backyards of the temple by whatever name called, and also the ground on which the temple car ordinarily stands."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"How can the Government prevent the sacrifice legally if it is made in a different place from the ordinary place used for the sacrifice."

DR. V. K. JOHN:—"It may be somebody doing an act with the object of committing an offence."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"It is not committing an offence. Clause 5 says 'No person shall sacrifice any animal inside any temple or its precincts'. I say that the sacrifice need not be in the temple or its precincts."

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON:—"Sir, the latter portion of the definition of 'precincts' says '... and in particular shall include the mandapams, prakarams, frontyards and backyards of the temple by whatever name called, and also the ground on which the temple car ordinarily stands'."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"As you know, these sacrifices take place in open places. There are places where ordinarily sacrifices are made. But if the sacrifice is not made in the ordinary place."

DR. V. K. JOHN:—"We can say 'or any other place', Sir."

* THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON:—"Sir, it will be very dangerous to say 'or any other place', because it will include sacrifices made inside houses also."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"It should be 'inside any temple or its precincts or with the intention of propitiating any deity'. The Hon. Minister can think over it and bring in an amendment."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"Sir, I accept the amendment. It is not the intention of the Bill to prevent any sacrifice being made in houses."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I hope you have understood me aright. The man takes it to the place where he has to sacrifice if. He does not get into the enclosure where usually sacrifices are made. But he goes about ten yards away, and in the full view of the deity makes the sacrifice. Under the Bill you cannot punish him."

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM:—"Sir, sacrifices for propitiating the deity are made in the streets, and this Bill does not provide for punishment in those cases."

26th January 1949]

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I think the definition of 'precincts' must be looked into by the Hon. Minister."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 5, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 6 was put and carried.

Clause 7.

MRS. MONA HENSMAN:—"Is it not that we accept Mr. Suryanarayana Rao's amendment that we shall allow no sacrifice to go on anywhere whether it is outside the precincts of the temple or inside?" 4-15 p.m.

MR. PRESIDENT:—"Does the hon. Member refer to clause 7? We shall leave that matter to some other amendment to be put down at a later date, as I have said already. We shall leave that matter for the present."

Clause 7 was put and carried.

Clause 8.

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO:—"With your permission, Sir, I move—

'That in clause 8 (c), for the word "and," the word "or" be substituted so that the clause may read:—

"Any person found guilty of an offence under section 7 shall be punished with simple imprisonment which may extend to three months or fine which may extend to three hundred rupees".'

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"I have no objection to accept the amendment."

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON:—"Simple imprisonment which may extend to three months or fine *or both*' may be the wording, Sir. I suggest the words 'or both' be added to the amendment of Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO:—"We have no objection."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I now put the amendments to the vote of the House. The amendments are that in clause 8 (c), for the word 'and' the word 'or' be substituted and the words 'or both' be added at the end."

The amendments were put and carried.

Clause 8 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 9 was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"I now move, Sir—

'That the Bill be passed into law'.

[Sri S. B. Adityan] [26th January 1949]

"I thank the hon. Members and I thank you, Sir, for affording me the opportunity for bringing in this Bill to-day and passing it so expeditiously. Sir, it may be that some amendments may be required in future for this Bill, but I might mention that clauses 5, 6 and 7 are intended against three kinds of persons—first of all, the person who sacrifices, secondly the person who acts as the 'pujari' and thirdly the person who permits the thing to be done. That is the scope of the Bill and if necessary, no doubt, some amendments may be brought to the Bill in future. I thank you, Sir."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"The question is—
'that the Bill to abolish animal sacrifices in connexion with Hindu temples be passed into law.'"

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE MADRAS WAKF BILL, 1947 (L.C. BILL NO. 3 OF 1947).

* ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—"I move, Sir—

'that the Madras Wakf Bill, 1947, be taken into consideration immediately'.

"Sir, the wakfs (endowments) are mismanaged and the money misappropriated. Wakf properties in many cases are alienated and sold and sometimes held by trespassers on account of which there is wasteful litigation. No accounts are maintained by Muthawallis; wakf property has come to be treated as personal and private property. The Bill seeks to establish a Board more or less on the lines of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, subject to the supervision of the Provincial Government, and to remedy the defects that are prevalent. It provides for the registration of wakfs. Muthawallis are obliged to maintain accounts. The Wakf Al-ul-aulad is also brought under the control of the proposed Board. The Board is authorized to appoint and remove Muthawallis. The Dargahs and Mukhbiras are also brought under the supervision and control of the Board. Procedure in respect of judicial proceedings is also provided for in this Bill. The Bill does not interfere with the succession of the Muthawallis except in the case of the Prince of Arcot's endowments which are controlled by a separate Act of 1923, which shuts out the jurisdiction of the courts and bars all suits against the Muthawallis and hence that Act is sought to be repealed, and the management of these wakfs is sought to be vested in a representative body.

"I do not think, Sir, there is time now to explain in greater detail the aims and objects of this Bill. Therefore, I simply now move, for the consideration of this Bill and request the Government to view this measure with sympathy."

DR. SYED TAJUDDIN :—"I second it. Sir."